Upon entry of this Response, claims 1-13 remain pending in the present patent application.

1. RESPONSE TO OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION

Claims 1-13 have been provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of copending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/635,452.

In this regard, Applicant acknowledges the rejection. However, due to the provisional nature of the rejection, no further action is warranted at this time.

2. RESPONSE TO REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 7-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims have been amended to recite that a program is embodied on a computer readable medium, as suggested in the Office Action. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

3. RESPONSE TO REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Stewart* (U.S. Patent No. 6,714,964) in view of *Hansen* (U.S. Patent No. 6,407,820).

a. Claim 1

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicant claims:

> A method of managing workflow in a commercial printing environment including a designer location and a print service provider location, said method comprising:
> creating a press ready file at the designer location using
> updated device configuration information from the print service provider location;
> submitting said press ready file to the print service provider location via an electronic network;
> ***verifying, at said print service provider location, that said***

> ***pressready file will print at said print service provider***
> ***location as designed at the designer location and, if not,***
> ***correcting said press ready file to ensure printing***
> ***substantially as designed; and***
> ***performing automated shipping using, if created, said***
> ***corrected press ready file, else using said verified press***
> ***ready file.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Stewart* in view of *Hansen* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "verifying, at said print service provider location, that said press ready file will print at said print service provider location as designed at the designer location and, if not, correcting said press ready file to ensure printing substantially as designed; and performing automated shipping using, if created, said corrected press ready file, else using said verified press ready file," as recited and emphasized above in claim 1.

Stewart describes a system where "a user may be located anywhere in the world and request copying or reproduction of a document according to specific parameters, and may view the final document electronically before the final document is produced in a hard copy format." Col. 4, lines 58-61. "Generally speaking, a user on the client side 300a of the network can request printing from, for example, a personal computer, and generate a document for shipping and/or delivery from printer side 300c." Col. 5, lines 26-30. In this process, the user can "configure the finishing and binding options for the document using the interface on the personal computer (625). Once document configuration information is validated, the user inputs shipping and payment data on the interface(630). The shipping and payment data are verified, and the print file is put in long term storage (635). The finishing and biding options are then combined with the postscript file to create a print ready file (640), and the print ready file is sent to the print queue (645) and transferred to the production facility (i.e. printing facility). A printer operator can then select a job and queues it to an available printer (655), and the job is ripped and sent to the printer (660). The printer punches and/or binds the job on-line (665), and the package is sent for delivery (675)." Col. 8, lines 56-67.

7

As such, *Stewart* fails to teach or suggest at least "verifying, at said print service provider location, that said press ready file will print at said print service provider location as designed at the designer location and, if not, correcting said press ready file to ensure printing substantially as designed; and performing automated shipping using, if created, said corrected press ready file, else using said verified press ready file," as recited in claim 1. *Hansen* fails to remedy these deficiencies.

For example, *Hansen* describes a system and method for managing production printing workflow. "The production workflow 100 includes the procedural stages of job origination 102, job submission 104, job preparation 106, print production 108 and final fulfillment 110." Cols. 3-4, lines 66-2. "Job origination 102 is the procedural stage of receiving the documents and instructions, which together are defined as a 'job', from the customer. Job origination 102 can occur when a customer physically brings his job, whether in hard copy or electronic form, to the print shop or otherwise transmits the job to the print shop, whether by phone, fax, postal mail, electronic mail or over a local area or wide area network such as over the Internet." Col. 4, lines 4-11. It is shown in Fig. 1, that the stages of job submission 104, job preparation 106, print production 108, and final fulfillment 110 take place at the print shop. Further, Fig. 2 shows that the preflight documents are collected from a store front computer 114, document library 118, APP/PDL files, and scanning support as part of the job submission and preparation stages 104, 106. *See* col. 8, lines 21-24. *Hansen* also discloses "[w]hen the production output device 122 receives the file for printing, it will interpret those instructions [from the ready for printer formatted file] to implement the desired feature. For page features which the current device 122 cannot handle, the device 122 can signal the operator that manual intervention is required and direct the operator through the appropriate steps to implement the page feature and complete the job." Col. 12, lines 17-23.

Hansen describes that various operators work in the print shop, see col. 8, lines 59-60, and the operator runs a production printer at the print shop. *See* col. 1, lines 48-50. *Hansen* further describes that the print shop can have policies or predefined rules for handling requests for capabilities that are not available or are in high demand, at the time of printing. *Hansen* discloses that a requested capability may be forced to be ignored or operator intervention may be requested during printing, as examples. *See*

col. 19, lines 8-26. Therefore, *Hansen* fails to disclose that the ready for print file is verified at the print service provider location to print as designed and if not, correcting the print file to ensure printing as designed. Additionally, *Hansen* discloses a manual or separate shipping process and fails to teach or suggest automated shipping using a press ready file. Accordingly, *Hansen* individually and in combination with *Stewart* clearly fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1, such as "verifying, at said print service provider location, that said press ready file will print at said print service provider location as designed at the designer location and, if not, correcting said press ready file to ensure printing substantially as designed; and performing automated shipping using, if created, said corrected press ready file, else using said verified press ready file," as recited in claim 1.

As a result, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and claim 1 is patentable over the proposed combination of *Stewart* in view of *Hansen*. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

b.   Claims 2-6

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons given above. Since claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features, claims 2-6 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

c.   Claim 7

As provided in independent claim 7, Applicant claims:

> A computer readable medium encoded with a program product for managing workflow in a commercial printing environment including a designer location and a print service provider location, said product comprising machine-readable program code for causing, when executed, a machine to perform the following method steps:
> creating a press ready file at the designer location using updated device configuration information from the print service provider location;
> submitting said press ready file to the print service provider location via an electronic network;
> ***verifying, at said print service provider location, that said***

9

> ***press ready file will print at said print service provider***
> ***location as designed at the designer location and, if not,***
> ***correcting said press ready file to ensure printing***
> ***substantially as designed; and***
>
> **performing automated shipping using, if created, said**
> > **corrected press ready file, else using said verified press**
> > **ready file.**

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 7 is allowable for at least the reason that *Stewart* in view of *Hansen* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "verifying, at said print service provider location, that said press ready file will print at said print service provider location as designed at the designer location and, if not, correcting said press ready file to ensure printing substantially as designed; and performing automated shipping using, if created, said corrected press ready file, else using said verified press ready file," as recited and emphasized above in claim 7.

Stewart describes a system where "a user may be located anywhere in the world and request copying or reproduction of a document according to specific parameters, and may view the final document electronically before the final document is produced in a hard copy format." Col. 4, lines 58-61. "Generally speaking, a user on the client side 300a of the network can request printing from, for example, a personal computer, and generate a document for shipping and/or delivery from printer side 300c." Col. 5, lines 26-30. In this process, the user can "configure the finishing and binding options for the document using the interface on the personal computer (625). Once document configuration information is validated, the user inputs shipping and payment data on the interface(630). The shipping and payment data are verified, and the print file is put in long term storage (635). The finishing and biding options are then combined with the postscript file to create a print ready file (640), and the print ready file is sent to the print queue (645) and transferred to the production facility (i.e. printing facility). A printer operator can then select a job and queues it to an available printer (655), and the job is ripped and sent to the printer (660). The printer punches and/or binds the job on-line (665), and the package is sent for delivery (675)." Col. 8, lines 56-67.

10

As such, *Stewart* fails to teach or suggest at least "verifying, at said print service provider location, that said press ready file will print at said print service provider location as designed at the designer location and, if not, correcting said press ready file to ensure printing substantially as designed; and performing automated shipping using, if created, said corrected press ready file, else using said verified press ready file," as recited in claim 7. *Hansen* fails to remedy these deficiencies.

For example, *Hansen* describes a system and method for managing production printing workflow. "The production workflow 100 includes the procedural stages of job origination 102, job submission 104, job preparation 106, print production 108 and final fulfillment 110." Cols. 3-4, lines 66-2. "Job origination 102 is the procedural stage of receiving the documents and instructions, which together are defined as a 'job', from the customer. Job origination 102 can occur when a customer physically brings his job, whether in hard copy or electronic form, to the print shop or otherwise transmits the job to the print shop, whether by phone, fax, postal mail, electronic mail or over a local area or wide area network such as over the Internet." Col. 4, lines 4-11. It is shown in Fig. 1, that the stages of job submission 104, job preparation 106, print production 108, and final fulfillment 110 take place at the print shop. Further, Fig. 2 shows that the preflight documents are collected from a store front computer 114, document library 118, APP/PDL files, and scanning support as part of the job submission and preparation stages 104, 106. *See* col. 8, lines 21-24. *Hansen* also discloses "[w]hen the production output device 122 receives the file for printing, it will interpret those instructions [from the ready for printer formatted file] to implement the desired feature. For page features which the current device 122 cannot handle, the device 122 can signal the operator that manual intervention is required and direct the operator through the appropriate steps to implement the page feature and complete the job." Col. 12, lines 17-23.

Hansen describes that various operators work in the print shop, see col. 8, lines 59-60, and the operator runs a production printer at the print shop. *See* col. 1, lines 48-50. *Hansen* further describes that the print shop can have policies or predefined rules for handling requests for capabilities that are not available or are in high demand, at the time of printing. *Hansen* discloses that a requested capability may be forced to be ignored or operator intervention may be requested during printing, as examples. *See*

col. 19, lines 8-26. Therefore, *Hansen* fails to disclose that the ready for print file is verified at the print service provider location to print as designed and if not, correcting the print file to ensure printing as designed. Additionally, *Hansen* discloses a manual or separate shipping process and fails to teach or suggest automated shipping using a press ready file. Accordingly, *Hansen* individually and in combination with *Stewart* clearly fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 7, such as "verifying, at said print service provider location, that said press ready file will print at said print service provider location as designed at the designer location and, if not, correcting said press ready file to ensure printing substantially as designed; and performing automated shipping using, if created, said corrected press ready file, else using said verified press ready file," as recited in claim 7.

As a result, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and claim 7 is patentable over the proposed combination of *Stewart* in view of *Hansen*. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 is respectfully requested.

d. Claims 8-12

Claim 7 is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons given above. Since claims 8-12 depend from claim 7 and recite additional features, claims 8-12 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

e. Claim 13

As provided in independent claim 13, Applicant claims:

> A system for managing workflow in a commercial printing environment including a designer location and a print service provider location, said system comprising:
> means for creating a press ready file at the designer location using updated device configuration information from the print service provider location;
> means for submitting said press ready file to the print service provider location via an electronic network;
> **means for verifying, at said print service provider location, that said press ready file will print at said print service provider location as designed at the designer location**

12

> *and, if not, correcting said press ready file to ensure*
> *printing substantially as designed; and*
> ***means for performing automated shipping using, if created,***
> ***said corrected press ready file, else using said verified***
> ***press ready file.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 13 is allowable for at least the reason that *Stewart* in view of *Hansen* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "means for verifying, at said print service provider location, that said press ready file will print at said print service provider location as designed at the designer location and, if not, correcting said press ready file to ensure printing substantially as designed; and means for performing automated shipping using, if created, said corrected press ready file, else using said verified press ready file," as recited and emphasized above in claim 13.

Stewart describes a system where "a user may be located anywhere in the world and request copying or reproduction of a document according to specific parameters, and may view the final document electronically before the final document is produced in a hard copy format." Col. 4, lines 58-61. "Generally speaking, a user on the client side 300a of the network can request printing from, for example, a personal computer, and generate a document for shipping and/or delivery from printer side 300c." Col. 5, lines 26-30. In this process, the user can "configure the finishing and binding options for the document using the interface on the personal computer (625). Once document configuration information is validated, the user inputs shipping and payment data on the interface(630). The shipping and payment data are verified, and the print file is put in long term storage (635). The finishing and biding options are then combined with the postscript file to create a print ready file (640), and the print ready file is sent to the print queue (645) and transferred to the production facility (i.e. printing facility). A printer operator can then select a job and queues it to an available printer (655), and the job is ripped and sent to the printer (660). The printer punches and/or binds the job on-line (665), and the package is sent for delivery (675)." Col. 8, lines 56-67.

As such, *Stewart* fails to teach or suggest at least "means for verifying, at said print service provider location, that said press ready file will print at said print service

13

provider location as designed at the designer location and, if not, correcting said press ready file to ensure printing substantially as designed; and means for performing automated shipping using, if created, said corrected press ready file, else using said verified press ready file," as recited in claim 13. *Hansen* fails to remedy these deficiencies.

For example, *Hansen* describes a system and method for managing production printing workflow. "The production workflow 100 includes the procedural stages of job origination 102, job submission 104, job preparation 106, print production 108 and final fulfillment 110." Cols. 3-4, lines 66-2. "Job origination 102 is the procedural stage of receiving the documents and instructions, which together are defined as a 'job', from the customer. Job origination 102 can occur when a customer physically brings his job, whether in hard copy or electronic form, to the print shop or otherwise transmits the job to the print shop, whether by phone, fax, postal mail, electronic mail or over a local area or wide area network such as over the Internet." Col. 4, lines 4-11. It is shown in Fig. 1, that the stages of job submission 104, job preparation 106, print production 108, and final fulfillment 110 take place at the print shop. Further, Fig. 2 shows that the preflight documents are collected from a store front computer 114, document library 118, APP/PDL files, and scanning support as part of the job submission and preparation stages 104, 106. *See* col. 8, lines 21-24. *Hansen* also discloses "[w]hen the production output device 122 receives the file for printing, it will interpret those instructions [from the ready for printer formatted file] to implement the desired feature. For page features which the current device 122 cannot handle, the device 122 can signal the operator that manual intervention is required and direct the operator through the appropriate steps to implement the page feature and complete the job." Col. 12, lines 17-23.

Hansen describes that various operators work in the print shop, see col. 8, lines 59-60, and the operator runs a production printer at the print shop. *See* col. 1, lines 48-50. *Hansen* further describes that the print shop can have policies or predefined rules for handling requests for capabilities that are not available or are in high demand, at the time of printing. *Hansen* discloses that a requested capability may be forced to be ignored or operator intervention may be requested during printing, as examples. *See* col. 19, lines 8-26. Therefore, *Hansen* fails to disclose that the ready for print file is

verified at the print service provider location to print as designed and if not, correcting the print file to ensure printing as designed. Additionally, *Hansen* discloses a manual or separate shipping process and fails to teach or suggest automated shipping using a press ready file. Accordingly, *Hansen* individually and in combination with *Stewart* clearly fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 13, such as "means for verifying, at said print service provider location, that said press ready file will print at said print service provider location as designed at the designer location and, if not, correcting said press ready file to ensure printing substantially as designed; and means for performing automated shipping using, if created, said corrected press ready file, else using said verified press ready file," as recited in claim 13.

As a result, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and claim 13 is patentable over the proposed combination of *Stewart* in view of *Hansen*. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles W. Griggers
Reg. No. 47,283